



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/399,696 | 09/21/1999 | KEHSING J. CHOU | ST9-99-093 | 2558 |

7590

09/12/2005

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACKEAK & SEAS
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

PHAM, HUNG Q

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2162

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. 09/399,696 | Applicant(s) CHOU ET AL. | |
| | Examiner HUNG Q. PHAM | Art Unit 2162 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
- NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5-9,11-15 and 17-21.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

The features of claims 4, 10 and 16 have been incorporated into claims 1, 7 and 13. Applicant's arguments with respect to the incorporated features have been fully considered but not persuasive. The Ito reference, taken as a whole, still discloses this feature.

Referring back to FIG. 1, Access Management Component 112v as *server connected to* Database Driver A and Database Driver B as *one or more heterogeneous data stores*. Upon issuance of SQL_RPC, the name server information processing system is inquired for connection with Access Management Component 112v (Col. 9, Lines 26-32). The Name Server Information Processing System 150 keep track the status of each component 112v or server, where the server in operation is labeled as RUN, the server in stationary state as STOP, and the server in fault as FAULT. The name server information processing system 150 replies with the port number and the network address of the server component if the value held in the status storage region is RUN (Col. 10, Lines 15-36). As seen, Access Management Component 112v as *server is selected to process the request based on whether the server can satisfy the request for data* using the status of each component 112v.


Ito further discloses the technique of *selecting* Access Management Component 112v as *server based on a load* condition of each Access Management Component 112v at Col. 15, Lines 18-28 and 54-66.

Numeric value indicating the load condition is given to a plurality of Access Management Component 112v, i.e., from 0 to 100 (Col. 16, Lines 29-42), and this performs the technique *the plurality of servers form a server hierarchy*.

The missing of Ito is the implementation of *Remote Method Invocation* on the *server*. However, RMI method for a remote procedure call to process a task on a remote server computer using stubs and skeleton is disclosed by Arnold at FIG. 3, Col. 6, Lines 4-41.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Remote Method Invocation into a Remote Procedure Call System in order to have a well translation of objects of a distributed system.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 17-21 are unpatentable as set forth in the Final Action at least by the reasons as discussed above and virtue of their dependency.


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER